

REMARKS

In the above-identified Office Action the claims were rejected again as being anticipated by the cited Gowda patent.

Applicants Response To the Previous Rejection

In response to the previous Office Action, wherein the claims were rejected as being anticipated by the Gowda patent, Applicants stressed their claim limitations of independent Claims 1 and 25 which state:

a drive circuit coupled to said pixels and adapted to output a first signal level at which said transfer switch is set in an OFF state, a second signal level at which said transfer switch is set in an ON state, and a third signal level between the first level and the second level,

wherein said drive circuit controls to hold the third signal level for a predetermined time while said transfer switch is changing from the ON state to the OFF state.

Accordingly, those limitations require that the claimed transfer switch is driven by three signal levels, first, second and third. In this regard Applicants asserted that the cited Gowda patent does not disclose those claimed requirements.

Also, Applicants stressed that independent Claims 5, 17, 26, and 27 include limitations requiring that the transfer switch is controlled with relation to its fall speed from ON to OFF. Applicants asserted that the Gowda patent also failed to disclose this requirement of Applicants above-identified claims.

Renewed Rejection in Office Action of January 26, 2006

In the above-identified Office Action, the claims were again rejected in view of the disclosure of Gowda, wherein it is stated that the Gowda circuitry is "capable" of performing in the same manner as set forth in Applicants' claims. In particular, the Office Action, in paragraphs 4 and 6, directs attention to Fig. 2, element 14, and col. 4, lines 27-61 of Gowda, and asserts that such text discloses the switching requirements of Applicants' claims with relation to the above-referenced three signal levels and the fall speed from ON to OFF.

The Cited Gowda Patent Does Not Disclose
Applicants' Claim Requirements

A careful reading of the cited Gowda patent, and particularly col. 4, lines 27-61 thereof, which is relied upon in the Office Action, reveals that Gowda does not disclose the above-characterized requirements of Applicants' independent Claims 1, 5, 17, 25, 26, or 27.

Specifically, Gowda is seen as only disclosing two signal levels, not three as required in Applicants' Claims 1 and 25. Nor does Gowda disclose in any way the fall speed of the signal between the ON and OFF states of the transfer switch.

It Is Improper to Reject Applicants' Claims Without Pointing
Out Where The Rejecting Reference Allegedly Discloses the Claim Requirements

Applicants respectfully submit, as was submitted in the last-filed

Amendment, that the cited Gowda patent does not disclose the specifically claimed first, second, and third signal levels of Applicants' Claims 1 and 25, nor does Gowda disclose the fall speed of the relationship of the signal as set forth in Applicants' Claims 5, 17, 26 and 27. Accordingly, since this deficiency of the disclosure of the Gowda patents was pointed out in the last-filed Amendment, it is improper to reassert this rejection without pointing out specifically where such disclosure is allegedly made in the Gowda patent.

For all these various reasons it is believed that the application is now allowable, and the issuance of a formal notice of Allowance is solicited.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant
John A. Krause
Registration No. 24,613

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 588221v1